

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/662,450	09/16/2003	Naoki Hiraoka	021312A 2503	
23850 7590 01/09/2007 ARMSTRONG, KRATZ, QUINTOS, HANSON & BROOKS, LLP 1725 K STREET, NW SUITE 1000 WASHINGTON, DC 20006			EXAMINER	
			WEBB, GREGORY E	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1751	
SHORTENED STATUTOR	Y PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
3 MONTHS 01/09/2007 PAP		PER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

1.
D

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	10/662,450	HIRAOKA ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Gregory E. Webb	1751				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply						
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).						
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 Oc	ctober 2006.					
2a) This action is FINAL . 2b) This	action is non-final.					
3) Since this application is in condition for allowan	3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is					
closed in accordance with the practice under E	closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Disposition of Claims						
4) ☐ Claim(s) 9-12 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration. 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☑ Claim(s) 9-12 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.						
Application Papers						
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acceed applicant may not request that any objection to the description of the description of the correction of the description of the correction of	pted or b) objected to by the Elrawing(s) be held in abeyance. See on is required if the drawing(s) is object.	37 CFR 1.85(a). ected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 						
Attachment(s)						
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary (Paper No(s)/Mail Dat 5) Notice of Informal Pa 6) Other:	e				

Application/Control Number: 10/662,450 Page 2

Art Unit: 1751

DETAILED ACTION

1. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

- 2. The remainder of the previous rejections are withdrawn based on the applicant's amendments to the claims. The following rejection is however maintained:
- 3. Claims 9-12 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Lai (US6721628).
- 4. The applicant's main argument suggests that the prior art fails to teach or suggest the initial calculation of the amount of oxidizing agent to be added to the mixing tank. The applicant argues that this calculation is done prior to adding the oxidizing agent and thus differs from the prior art.
- 5. However we can see from the Lai abstract that such statements are far from true. In fact Lai states in the abstract that the calculation is performed based on the concentration of the tank and the level of the fluid in the tank. The following Lai abstract makes this clear:

"Polishing slurry is transported via piping to flow into the closed loop control system. First, the polishing slurry flows into the ultrasonic concentration detector. Original data of the polishing slurry that is determined by means of ultrasonic concentration detector is a fluid velocity at that time. This determined value can be converted into weight percent concentration at that time by memory data

will be transmitted into program logic controller (PLC), and the data of liquid level volume in the distribution tank will be transmitted into program logic controller at present. The program logic controller will then analyze whether the quantity of oxidant is sufficient. If the quantity of oxidant does not reach the required criterion, the program logic controller will control the analog valve to transmit a supplementary quantity of oxidant into the distribution tank via the analog valve and piping." (emphasis added)

It is not clear to the examiner how the input of two variables (height and weight percent) to arrive at a third variable, the quantity of oxidant to add, does not constitute a calculation prior to the addition. The use of height and weight allows for the calculation of net oxidant in the mixing tank and would further allow one to calculate the necessary oxidant to add to make up the difference.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Gregory E. Webb whose telephone number is 571-272-1325. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:00-17:30 (m-f).

Art Unit: 1751

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Douglass McGinty can be reached on (571)272-1029. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Sm

Gregory E. Webb Primary Examiner Art Unit 1751

gew